

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed August 14, 2006. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Claims 3, 5, 7-9 and 22 have been canceled. Claims 23-34 have been withdrawn. Claims 1-4, 6, 10-21, 23-34 remain pending. Applicants thank the Examiner for consideration of the previous amendment and remarks and for withdrawing the objections to the disclosure and rejections under §112 and §102(b).

Rejections Under § 102(b)

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-2, 6, 12, 13, 15, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Ruck (US 4,388,077). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements from claim 3. As amended claim 1 now includes the step of washing the laundry with a detergent use solution in a laundry washing machine prior to applying a bleaching and antimicrobial composition to the laundry. Applicants note that claim 3 was not rejected under §102(b) in light of Ruck and therefore believe that claim 1 as amended is now distinguished from Ruck. Applicants have also amended claim 1 to change the pH ranges. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under §103(a)

Barnes

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-2, 6, 9-13, and 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnes (US 4,988,363). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements from claim 3. As amended claim 1 now includes the step of washing the laundry with a detergent use solution in a laundry washing machine prior to applying a bleaching and antimicrobial composition to the laundry.

Applicants note that claim 3 was not rejected under §103(a) in light of Barnes and therefore believe that claim 1 as amended is now distinguished from Barnes. Applicants have also amended claim 1 to change the pH ranges. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Macbeath

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-2, 6, 11-13, 15-16, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Macbeath (US 5,716,923). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements from claim 3. As amended claim 1 now includes the step of washing the laundry with a detergent use solution in a laundry washing machine prior to applying a bleaching and antimicrobial composition to the laundry. Applicants note that claim 3 was not rejected under §103(a) in light of Macbeath and therefore believe that claim 1 as amended is now distinguished from Macbeath. Applicants have also amended claim 1 to change the pH ranges. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Ruck, Barnes, or Macbeath and further in view of Reinwald et al.

The Office Action has rejected claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruck, Barnes, or Macbeath further in view of Reinwald et al. (US 4,118,189). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements from claim 9. As amended claim 1 now states that a pH adjuster is added when applying a bleaching and antimicrobial composition to the laundry to increase the pH from the second pH to the first pH. Applicants note that claim 9 was not rejected under §103(a) in light of Ruck, Barnes, or Macbeath in view of

Reinwald et al. and therefore believe that claim as amended is now distinguished from the prior art of record. Applicants have also amended claim 1 to change the pH ranges. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Ruck, Barnes, or Macbeath further in view of Werdehausen et al.

The Office Action has rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruck, Barnes, or Macbeath further in view of Werdehausen et al. (US 3,718,597).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements from claims 3 and 9. As amended claim 1 now states that a pH adjuster is added when applying a bleaching and antimicrobial composition to the laundry to increase the pH from the second pH to the first pH and that the laundry is washed with a detergent use solution prior to applying the bleaching and antimicrobial composition. Applicants note that claims 3 and 9 were not rejected under §103(a) in light of Ruck, Barnes, or Macbeath in view of Reinwald et al. Applicants have also amended claim 1 to change the pH ranges. Claim 14 claims priority back to claim 13 which claims priority back to claim 1. Therefore, claim 14 includes all of the new elements of amended claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 14, through the amendments to claim 1, is distinguished over the prior art of record. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Ruck or Macbeath further in view of Barnes

The Office Action has rejected claims 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ruck or Macbeath further in view of Barnes. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements from claims 3 and 9. As amended claim 1 now states that a pH adjuster is added when applying a bleaching and antimicrobial composition to the laundry to increase the pH from the second pH to the first pH

and that the laundry is washed with a detergent use solution prior to applying the bleaching and antimicrobial composition. Applicants note that claims 3 and 9 were not rejected under §103(a) in light of Ruck, or Macbeath in view of Barnes. Applicants have also amended claim 1 to change the pH ranges. Claims 16-19 claim priority back to claim 1. Therefore, claims 16-19 include all of the new elements of amended claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 16-19, through the amendments to claim 1, are distinguished over the prior art of record. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Summary

It is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims is in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is kindly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's primary attorney-of-record, Anneliese S. Mayer, at (651) 795-5661, if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby.

Please consider this a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME for a sufficient number of months to enter these papers or any future reply, if appropriate. Please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501257.



Dated: November 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

ECOLAB INC.
Law Department
Mail Stop ESC-F7
655 Lone Oak Drive
Eagan, Minnesota 55121
Phone Number: (651) 795-5661
Fax Number: (651) 204-7507

By: /Anneliese S. Mayer/
Name: Anneliese S. Mayer
Reg. No. 54,434